REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 4-19, 42-86 and 90-92 are pending in the present application. Claims 6, 7, 9-16, 42-50, 58-64, 74-80 and 92 were amended. No claims were added or canceled. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the Specification, for example, on page 31, lines 29-30, and in original claims. The listing of the claims beginning on page 2 of this response replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-8, 9-19, 42-57, and 58-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

> Referring to claims 7-8, claims 7-8 are directed to a method. A data processing system is mentioned in the preamble which means that the data processing system is an intended use and not a positive claim recitation. The method steps are not performed by a particular machine and the steps also are abstract and lacking a particular practical application and therefore preempt all practical uses of and consequently the claims are non-statutory.
>
> Referring to claims 9-19, claims 9-19 are directed to a method. A data processing system is mentioned in the preamble which means that the data processing system is an intended use and not a positive claim recitation. The method steps are not performed by a particular machine and the steps also are abstract and lacking a particular practical application and therefore preempt all practical uses of and consequently the claims are non-statutory.
>
> Referring to claims 42-57, claims 42-57 are directed to a method. A data processing system is mentioned in the preamble which means that the data processing system is an intended use and not a positive claim recitation. The method steps are not performed by a particular machine and the steps also are abstract and lacking a particular practical application and therefore preempt all practical uses of and consequently the claims are non-statutory.
>
> Referring to claims 58-73, claims 58-73 are directed to a data processing system or machine.
> The claims lack a particular practical application and therefore preempt all practical uses of and consequently the claims are non-statutory.

> Referring to claims 74-86, claims 74-86 are directed to a computer readable medium or article of manufacture. Applicant's amended specification still defines the computer readable medium definition as open ended; consequently, the computer readable medium can still be interpreted as a transitory medium and the claims limitations lack a particular practical application and therefore preempt all practical uses of and consequently these claims are non-statutory because the computer readable medium can still be interpreted as a transitory medium or signal. The examiner recommends that the applicant amend the claim to a non-transitory computer readable medium and to argue on the record that there is no intent for the computer readable medium to be interpreted as a transitory medium or signal. The applicant also needs to amend the claim to add a particular practical application.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010 page 18.

With respect to the rejection of method claims 7-8, claim 7 has been amended to recite that steps therein are performed by a processor. Therefore, the steps are performed by a particular machine. In addition, claim 7 has been amended to recite a further step of "a source identified by the source identifier using a target identified by the mapped target identifier in a distributed computing environment." Therefore, claim 7 also recites a practical application. Claim 7, accordingly, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in all respects.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and also satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 by virtue of its dependency.

With respect to the rejection of method claims 9-19 and 42-57, independent claims 9 and 42 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 7, and also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Dependent claims 10-16 and 43-50 have also been amended as appropriate to specify that the steps recited therein are performed by a processor. Claims 9-19 and 42-47, accordingly, also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in their present form.

With respect to data processing system claims 58-73, independent claim 58 has been amended to recite that the processor performs the further action of "a source identified by the source identifier using a target identified by the mapped target identifier in a distributed computing environment." Claim 58, therefore, recites a practical application and satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 101. Dependent claims 59-73 also satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101, at least by virtue of their dependency.

With respect to computer program product claims 74-86, independent claim 74 has been amended to recite "a non-transitory computer readable medium including instructions." There is

no intent for the computer readable medium recited in claim 74 to be interpreted as including a transitory medium or signal.

In addition, claim 74 has been amended to include a practical application.

Therefore, claims 74-86 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in their present form.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 7-8, 9-19, 42-57, and 58-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-13, 44-46, 60-62 and 74-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

> Referring to claims 11-13, 44-46, 60-62, & 76-78; what is meant by "its"?
>
> Referring to claim 74-84, because there are two comprising in the claim limitation it is unclear whether applicant is claiming a computer program product or computer readable medium.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010 page 19.

Rejected claims 11-13, 44-46, 60-62 and 76-78 have been amended to avoid use of the word "its". Also, claims 6 and 92 have been amended to avoid use of the word "its." In addition, claim 74 has been amended to clarify that a computer program product is being claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now clear and definite throughout and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Therefore the rejection of claims 11-13, 44-46, 60-62 and 74-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

III.A. Claims 4-6 and 90-92

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6 and 90-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, hereinafter "AAPA" in view of Mackey (U.S.

Patent No.; 6,163,879), hereinafter "Mackey" and further in view of Callon (U.S. Patent No.: 6,643,287), hereinafter "Callon". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states with respect to claim 4:

> Referring to Claim 4, Admitted Prior Art teaches a routing method in a data processing system (Figs lA, lB, Figs 2A, Fig 2B, Fig 2C, and Fig 2D perform the method) comprising:
>
> retrieving (CPUS per Fig 1B perform retrieving) hashing for hashing the key to determine a table index into a table (CPUs per Fig 1B perform hashing of a key per 222 per Fig 2D)
>
> Reading a target address from a table entry using the table index (CPUS per Fig 1B perform reading of the target address per 226 per Fig 2D)
>
> Reading a target address form a table entry using the table index wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a mathematical computation using the table index and the target address as values in the computation (202 per Fig 2D has target address which has been related to and stored in a table entry based on computed value using table index and target address as values in the computation) modifying (The CPUs per Fig 1B perform modifying)
>
> Admitted Prior Art does not expressly call for: relation computation using operands or retrieving a destination address from the data packet, hashing the destination address and modifying the data packet by storing the target address in the data packet and transmitting the modified data packet
>
> Mackey teaches: relationship computation using operands (relation between variables or operands is mathematical computation per col. 4 lines 45-51)
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the relation computation using operands or variables of Mackey in place of the mathematical combine computation of Mackey because relationship using operands performs the same function as mathematical combine computation.
>
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: retrieving a destination address from the data packet, hashing the destination address and modifying the data packet by storing the target address in the data packet and transmitting the modified data packet Callon teaches: retrieving a destination address from the data packet, hashing the destination address and modifying the data packet by storing the target address in the data packet and transmitting the modified data packet (examines the destination address or retrieving, hashing the destination address to determine an inherent key and then

utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address as well as transmitting the data packet into the packet

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the retrieving the destination address from the data packet, hashing the destination address of modifying the data packet by storing the target address in the data packet and transmitting of Callon to the system of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010, pages 2-3.

Claim 4 is as follows:

4. A routing method in a data processing system comprising the steps of:
receiving a data packet;
retrieving a destination address from the data packet;
hashing the destination address to determine a table index into a table in a computer readable medium;
reading a target address from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target address as operands in the relation computation;
modifying the data packet by storing the target address in the data packet; and
transmitting the modified data packet.

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). In determining obviousness, the scope and content of the prior art are… determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are… ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or non-obviousness of the subject matter is determined. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). "Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion

claimed by the patent at issue." *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007). "*Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.* Id. (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006))."

In the present case, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because neither AAPA nor Mackey nor Callon nor their combination teaches or suggests all the claim features. With respect to claim 4, for example, neither AAPA nor Mackey nor Callon nor their combination teaches or suggests at least "reading a target address from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target address as operands in the relation computation."

In rejecting the claim, the Examiner acknowledges, and Applicants agree, that AAPA does not teach a relation computation using operands but cites Mackey as disclosing this feature in col. 4, lines 45-51, reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner:

> As should be understood, the term "adjustable element" refers to any portion of a line of code **32** that is intended to be adjustable within such line of code **32**, and can include, but is not limited to variables, relations between variables, numerical values, arguments, mathematical functions, conditions, constants, and the like.

Mackey, col. 4, lines 45-51.

Mackey relates to a method for writing and modifying lines of program code and, at best, may disclose that a portion of a line of code may be adjustable. To the extent that Mackey may disclose performing computations of some kind, Mackey does not teach or in any way suggest that a target address be related to and stored in a table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using a table index and a target address as operands in the relation computation as required by claim 4. Only the present disclosure contains such a teaching, and there is nothing in Mackey that would suggest modifying AAPA as proposed by the Examiner. Accordingly, neither AAPA nor Mackey nor their combination teaches or suggests "reading a target address from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target address as operands in the relation computation", and claim 4

is not obvious in view of and patentably distinguishes over the cited references for at least this reason.

Callon is cited as disclosing retrieving a destination address, hashing the destination address and modifying the data packet., and does not supply the deficiencies in AAPA and Mackey as discussed above. Therefore, AAPA in view of Mackey and Callon also does not disclose or suggest "reading a target address from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target address as operands in the relation computation," and claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the cited references in its present form.

Claim 90 also recites "reading a target address from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target address has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target address as operands in the relation computation" and patentably distinguishes over the cited references for similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 4. In addition, claim 90 further recites "wherein the relation computation is a nearness function." The cited references also do not disclose or suggest this feature. The Examiner asserts otherwise referring to page 14, lines 1-10 of the present Specification:

> **Figure 2D** illustrates a series of steps in which a key, such as a URL, is mapped to a particular proxy server in the target set through a type of hash routing provided by CARP. Key **220** is hashed by hash function **222** into a hash value **224**, which is then mathematically combined through function **226** with each of the hash values **214-218**. The result from each of these hash operations is a value which is regarded as a score that indicates a level of association between the key and a particular target. Scores **228-232** are then compared to each other to find the lowest or highest score.

Specification, page 14, lines 1-10.

The above recitation does not discuss a nearness function or that a relation computation is a nearness function. A nearness function is discussed beginning on page 16, line 23 of the present Specification, and an example of a nearness function that may be used in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention is described beginning on page 29, line 28 of the present Specification with reference to Figure 6.

AAPA in view of Mackey and Callon, accordingly, also does not disclose or suggest "wherein the relation computation is a nearness function" as recited in claim 90, and claim 90 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references for this reason, as well.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from and further restrict claim 4 and claims 91 and 92 depend from and further restrict claim 90. These claims also patentably distinguish over the cited references, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 4-6 and 90-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III.B. Claims 9-11, 14-16, 42-44, 47-54, 58-60, 63-70, 74-76 and 79-86

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-11, 14-16, 42-44, 47-54, 58-60, 63-70, 74-76 and 79-86 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Mackey. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states with respect to claim 9:

> Referring to claim 9, the Admitted Prior art teaches: a method in a data processing system for mapping a source identifier to a target identifier (Fig 2D performs the method), the method comprising the steps of:
>
> Hashing the source identifier to determine a table index into a table in a computer readable medium (222 hashes the key or source identifier to determine a hash value or table index in the Target Set per Fig 2D which is stored in RAM or ROM per Fig 1B)
>
> Reading the target identifier from a table entry using the table index, wherein the target identifier has been related and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a computation using the table index and the target identifier as values in the computation (226 per Fig 2D reads the target identifier from Target Set per Fig 2D. The Target Set has a Target (Target Identifier) and Hash Value (table index) is determined from a mathematical combined computation per Pg 14 lines 13 of applicant's specification)
>
> Admitted Prior Art does not expressly call for: relation computation using operands Mackey teaches: relationship computation using operands (relation between variables or operands is mathematical computation per col. 4 lines 45-51)
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the relation computation using operands or variables of Mackey in place of the mathematical combine computation of Mackey because

relationship using operands performs the same function as mathematical combine computation.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010, pages 5-6.

Claim 9, as amended herein, is as follows:

9. A method in a data processing system for mapping a source identifier to a target identifier, the method comprising the steps of:

a processor hashing the source identifier to determine a table index into a table in a computer readable medium;

the processor reading the target identifier from a table entry in the table using the table index, wherein the target identifier has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target identifier as operands in the relation computation; and

a source identified by the source identifier using a target identified by the target identifier in a distributed computing environment.

The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting 9-11, 14-16, 42-44, 47-54, 58-60, 63-70, 74-76 and 79-86 because neither AAPA nor Mackey nor their combination teach or suggest all the claim features. With respect to claim 9, for example, neither AAPA nor Mackey nor their combination teaches or suggests at least "the processor reading the target identifier from a table entry in the table using the table index, wherein the target identifier has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target identifier as operands in the relation computation."

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner acknowledges, and Applicants agree, that AAPA does not teach relational computation using operands. The Examiner asserts, however, that Mackey teaches relational computation using operands, citing to col. 4, lines 45-51, reproduced above. As discussed in detail above with respect to the rejection of claims 4-6 and 90-92, Mackey, at best, may disclose that a portion of a line of code may be adjustable, but does not teach or in any way suggest that a target address be related to and stored in a table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using a table index and a target address as operands in the relation computation. Only the present application contains such disclosure.

Furthermore, as also discussed above, Mackey is directed to a method for writing and modifying lines of program code, and it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to look to Mackey in order to map a source identifier to a target identifier. Accordingly, neither AAPA nor Mackey nor their combination teaches or suggests "the processor

reading the target identifier from a table entry in the table using the table index, wherein the target identifier has been related to and stored in the table entry based on a computed value from a relation computation using the table index and the target identifier as operands in the relation computation", and claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the cited references in its present form.

Independent claims 42, 58 and 74 recite similar subject matter as claim 9 and also patentably distinguish over the cited references in their present form.

Claims 10-11, 14-16, 43-44, 47-54, 59-60, 63-70, 75-76 and 79-86 depend from and further restrict one of the independent claims, and also patentably distinguish over the cited references, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 9-11, 14-16, 42-44, 47-54, 58-60, 63-70, 74-76 and 79-86 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III.C. Claims 17-18, 55-56 and 71-72

The Examiner has rejected claims 17-18, 55-56 and 71-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Mackey and further in view of Callon (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,287), hereinafter "Callon".

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

> Referring to claim 17, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teaches: the method of claim 9,
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address Callon teaches: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address (Hashing the destination address to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network address of Callon in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.
>
> Referring to claim 18, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the method of claim 9,
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address Callon teaches: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address (Hashing the destination address

to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network physical address of Callon to in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.
Referring to claim 55, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the method of claim 42,
The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address
Callon teaches: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address (Hashing the destination address to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network address of Callon in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.
Referring to claim 56, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the method of claim 42,
The Admitted Prior Art does not expressly call for: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address Callon teaches: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address (Hashing the destination address to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network physical address of Callon to in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.

Referring to claim 71, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teaches: the data processing system of claim 58
The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address
Callon teaches: wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address (Hashing the destination address to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network address of Callon in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.
Referring to claim 72, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the data processing system of claim 58

> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address Callon teaches: wherein the target identifier is a network physical address (Hashing the destination address to determine key and then utilizing the key to determine the next hop which inherently requires inserting the next hop destination address into the packet
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network physical address of Callon to in place of the key of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to build a system which can route packets.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010, pages 14-16.

Claims 17-18, 55-56 and 71-72 depend from and further restrict one of independent claims 9, 42 and 58. Callon is cited as disclosing wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address, wherein the target identifier is a network physical address and wherein the source identifier is a network protocol address. Callon does not, however, supply the deficiencies in AAPA and Mackey with respect to the independent claims as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 17-18, 55-56 and 71-72 patentably distinguish over the cited references, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 17-18, 55-56 and 71-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III.D. Claim 68

The Examiner has rejected claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Mackey and further in view of Woo (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,147), hereinafter "Woo".

In rejecting the claim, the Examiner states:

> Referring to claim 68, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the data processing system of claim 64 and Admitted Prior Art teaches: further comprising wherein the computation resource identified by the target identifier (Fig 2D and per Pg 1 Para 2 to Pg 6 Para 2)
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: router
> Woo teaches: router (router address determined by hashing per col. 8 lines 32 to 47)
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the router of Woo in place of the target identifier of the

combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to determine where to route the packet.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010, pages 16-17.

Woo is cited as disclosing a router. Woo, does not, however, supply the deficiencies in AAPA and Mackey with respect to the independent claims as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claim 68 patentably distinguish over the cited art, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III.E. Claims 57 and 73

The Examiner has rejected claims 57 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Mackey and further in view of Kravets (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,377), hereinafter "Kravets".

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states:

> Referring to claim 57, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the method of claim 42 and target identifier
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: URL
> Kravets teaches: URL (URL per col. 8 lines 45-49)
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the URL of Kravets in place of the target identifier of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to determine where to route the packet.
>
> Referring to claim 73, the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey teach: the data processing system of claim 58 and target identifier
> The combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey do not expressly call for: URL
> Kravets teaches: URL (URL per col. 8 lines 45-49)
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the URL of Kravets in place of the target identifier of the combination of Admitted Prior Art and Mackey in order to determine where to route the packet.

Office Action dated March 25, 2010, page 17.

Kravets is cited as teaching a URL. Kravets does not, however, supply the deficiencies in AAPA and Mackey with respect to the independent claims as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claim57 and 73 patentably distinguish over the cited art, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 57 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 45, 46, 61, 62, 77 and 78 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 112 grounds only. In view of the above amendments to the claims, these claims should now be allowed.

V. Conclusion

For at least all the above reasons, it is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. It is, accordingly, respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Gerald H. Glanzman
Reg. No. 25,035
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants